



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

18 DEC. 2009

Brussels,  
D(2009)

## Opinion

**Title** **Impact Assessment on: Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning type approval requirements for two- and three- wheelers and quadricycles**  
**(draft version of 23 November 2009)**

**Lead DG** **DG ENTR**

### 1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion

#### **(A) Context**

This impact assessment accompanies a proposal to simplify the current legislative framework for type approval of L-category vehicles (e.g. motorcycles); strengthen the emission standards for these vehicles; improve their safety standards; and adapt the current legislative framework to technical progress.

#### **(B) Positive aspects**

The report provides a considerable amount of information and analysis of the suggested type approval measures for L-category vehicles.

#### **(C) Main recommendations for improvements**

*The recommendations below are listed in order of descending importance. Some more technical comments have been transmitted directly to the author DG and are expected to be incorporated in the final version of the impact assessment report.*

**General recommendation: While the report contains most of the relevant elements necessary to underpin this policy, efforts should be made to improve the presentation of the analysis. The report needs in particular to present a clear comparison of the various options and provide an overview of all quantitative and qualitative elements of the analysis of impacts. It should be clearer about the extent to which self-regulation is a feasible option, and about the use of international standards. The impacts of the proposed measures on international trade should also be addressed. Furthermore, the report needs to clarify the level of ambition of the**

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles / Europese Commissie, B-1049 Brussel - Belgium. Telephone: (32-2) 299 11 11. Office: BERL 6/29. Telephone: direct line (32-2) 2981898. Fax: (32-2) 2965960.

E-mail: [impact-assessment-board@ec.europa.eu](mailto:impact-assessment-board@ec.europa.eu)  
Website: [http://www.cc.cec/iab/i/index\\_en.cfm](http://www.cc.cec/iab/i/index_en.cfm)

**suggested emission standards and provide additional details about the proposed vehicle labelling. Finally, the monitoring and evaluation arrangements should be clarified.**

**DG ENTR agreed during the meeting to take these comments on board. Given the importance of a clear presentation of the analysis for a good understanding of the impact of the proposed measures, the Board recommends that DG ENTR work closely with the Board secretariat in making the necessary improvements.**

**(1) Present a clear comparison of options and provide an overview of all quantitative and qualitative elements of the analysis of impacts.** The report should clearly present in the main text and executive summary a comparison of the various options and their impacts. It should explain possible trade offs between options related to simplification, environmental and safety standards and categorisation of vehicles. The overall impact and cumulative costs/benefits of the preferred options should be provided in a separate table. Certain inconsistencies in the choice of preferred options should be clarified (e.g. while the analysis of options 2 and 3 for durability requirements suggests that the advantages and disadvantages are very similar (p.113), option 2 is selected as the preferred one (p.32); the option of in-use conformity testing of emissions is discarded due to its low cost-efficiency (p.27) while it appears to be more cost-efficient than the preferred option on evaporative emission test measure (p.89)). Furthermore, the report should clarify to which extent some of the producers already meet the proposed environmental and safety requirements.

**(2) Be clearer about the structure of the market, and the implications of this structure for the feasibility of self-regulation.** While the report provides detailed information about the structure of the L-category market in the EU, it should highlight the market share distribution, in particular the share of EU producers compared to third country producers, and explain the implications of this distribution for the possible use of self-regulation. The report should also clarify to what extent the international standards for L-category vehicles are in line with the level of ambition of the safety and environmental objectives of the current policy proposal and to which extent they could be used to replace the existing regulatory framework. As regards the policy options for new emissions standards, the report should make clear that while option 3 is based on the content of the potential self-obligations put forward by industry, the instrument used would be a Regulation. It should also clarify whether the industry behaviour in the absence of such a Regulation would allow the targeted emission standards to be reached.

**(3) Assess the international impacts of the options.** The report should analyse the impacts of the introduction of new European environment and safety standards on EU exports to third countries and on producers from third countries exporting to the EU. It should in particular explain that the impacts of the proposed measures will vary for different market segments (lower versus higher priced products) and link this to the countries which export in this sectors (e.g. China, India and Japan).

**(4) Clarify the level of ambition of suggested emission standards and provide further details about CO<sub>2</sub> and fuel efficiency labelling.** The report should clarify the level of ambition of proposed new emission standards in relation to current standards for L-category vehicles and better explain the time period for application of the new standards. The report should clarify the expected consumer demand for information about CO<sub>2</sub> emission and fuel efficiency labelling of L-category vehicles and substantiate this with evidence from stakeholders' organisations. Furthermore, it should clarify the costs of

the suggested labelling scheme; explain the parallelism with the labelling for cars; and clarify how the labelling relates to the prevention of tampering of vehicles by the consumers.

**(5) Clarify the monitoring and evaluation arrangements.** The report should be clearer about which indicators will be used to measure to what extent the proposed policy is properly implemented and achieves its objectives. It should also specify who will be responsible for collecting and analysing these data, and indicate how and when the policy will be evaluated.

#### **(D) Procedure and presentation**

The main elements of the analysis - in particular the analysis of impacts and the comparison of the options - should be presented more comprehensively in the main text of the report and in the executive summary. The length of the report should be kept close to the recommended page limit, and efforts should be made to improve the readability of the report for the non-specialist readers. The annexes should be consolidated – for each set of policy options; the tables with quantitative analysis of the options should be merged with those comparing the options (e.g. Annexes X and XIV for simplification options).

## **2) IAB scrutiny process**

Reference number	2009/ENTR/002 (simplification)
Author DG	DG ENTR
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	16 December 2009
Date of adoption of Opinion	18 DEC. 2009